

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Claims 1, 26, 46, and 51 have been amended. Claims 1-33 and 46-51 are presented for examination.

Examiner rejected claims 1-33 and 46-51 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 00/72534 A1 (Rabe-Hesketh et al) and WO 01/01663 A1 (Gabrielsson et al).

Rabe-Hesketh is directed at the handling of messages with large attachments such as images and video. (Rabe-Hesketh, p. 1, ll. 5-8). In Rabe-Hesketh, the incoming mail is scanned, attachments are detected, removed, and replaced with associated links. (Rabe-Hesketh, p. 11, ll. 7-19). Furthermore, the attachment-processing means in Rabe-Hesketh may be configured to remove only those attachments that meet predetermined criteria such as the type and the size of the attachment. (Rabe-Hesketh, p. 11, ll. 29-37). Rabe-Hesketh fails to disclose or suggest, however, that the removing of a particular attachment is “responsive to identifying the particular attachment as **exceeding capabilities of an intended recipient’s receiving device**,” as recited in claims 1 and 51 as amended.

Gabrielsson is directed at a method of organizing incoming electronic messages for a user who can access her messages via at least two different types of access environments. In Gabrielsson, a processing means processes the original electronic message into several versions of processed electronic messages. (Gabrielsson, p. 8, ll. 21-25.) An intended recipient may choose to access a particular version of the processed electronic message depending on the recipient’s access environment.

(Gabrielsson, p. 9, ll. 3-14.) Gabrielsson, whether considered separately or in combination with Rabe-Hesketh, fails to disclose or suggest either “removing of a particular attachment” or that the removing of a particular attachment is “responsive to identifying the particular attachment as **exceeding capabilities of an intended recipient’s receiving device**,” as recited in claim 1 and 51 as amended.

Because the combination of Gabrielsson and Rabe-Hesketh fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 1, claim 1, its dependent claims, and claim 51 are patentable and should be allowed.

Claim 26, as amended, recites “**responsive to identifying the objects as exceeding capabilities of an intended recipient’s receiving device**, detaching said objects from said message.” Thus, claim 26 and its dependent claims are patentable and should be allowed for at least the reasons articulated with respect to claim 1.

Claim 46, as amended, recites “an attachment processing module for replacing the attachment with at least one reference **responsive to identifying the attachment as exceeding capabilities of the target device**.” Thus, claim 46 and its dependent claims are patentable and should be allowed for at least the reasons articulated with respect to claim 1.

Applicant respectfully submits that in view of the amendments and discussion set forth herein, the applicable rejections have been overcome. Accordingly, the present and amended claims should be found to be in condition for allowance.

If a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Elena Dreszer at (408) 947-8200.

If there are any additional charges/credits, please charge/credit our deposit  
account no. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,  
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 7-27-05



---

Elena B. Dreszer  
Reg. No. 55,128

Customer No. 08791  
12400 Wilshire Blvd.  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025  
(408) 720-8300